IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Appellant:	Hewlett Packard Co.	Patent Application	
Serial No.:	10/058,097	Group Art Unit:	2179
Filed:	January 29, 2002	Examiner:	Huynh, B.

For: SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR DEVELOPING AND PROCESSING A GRAPHICAL USER INTERFACE FOR A COMPUTER APPLICATION

Reply Brief

HP-200400110-1/RAR/JPH

Reply to Examiner's Answer

The Appellant submits the following remarks in response to the Examiner's Answer. In these remarks, the Appellant addresses certain arguments presented in the Examiner's Answer. Although only certain arguments are addressed in this Reply Brief, it should not be construed that the Appellant agrees with other arguments presented in the Examiner's Answer.

After reviewing the Examiner's Answer, Appellant respectfully maintains that the embodiments of the claimed invention that are set forth in the rejected Claims are not anticipated or rendered obvious by Ko et al. In particular, as discussed in the Appeal Brief, Ko et al. does not teach or suggest a method of displaying a visible portion of a user interface for an application program that comprises defining a graphical image for a visible portion of the user interface in a first computer file and "defining in a second computer file a plurality of parameters for associating a functional portion of the user interface with the graphical image" as is set forth in independent Claim 26 (independent Claims 8, 12, 14, 27 and 28 recite similar limitations).

The Examiner contends in the Examiner's Answer that file default.xtc disclosed in Ko et al. can be equated to the recited second computer file because it is disclosed that file default.xtc "specifies the functionality of portions" of a graphical image (see Ko et al. page 6, lines 12-13). Furthermore, the Examiner references Ko et al. page 7, lines 2-3 to substantiate this contention, where it is disclosed that the "Directive Function=Back specifies the function" of a button image. However, despite the Examiner's contentions to the contrary, Appellant respectfully submits that Ko et

al. does not teach or suggest that the disclosed button image is defined in a first computer file and that a plurality of parameters for associating functions with the button image are defined in a second computer file. In fact, Ko et al. does not identify a file where the function of the button image is specified. Consequently, the above referenced passage from Ko et al., at best, merely indicates that a directive specifies the function of the button image.

However, assuming arguendo that Ko et al. does teach that the button image and the button function are defined in first and second files respectively as suggested by the Examiner, Ko et al. clearly does not disclose that a plurality of parameters for associating functions with the button image are defined in the second file. Ko et al. merely discloses that "the function of the button" is specified in a file. Importantly, the focus of Ko et al. in this regard is a specification of a function as opposed to the defining of a plurality of parameters. It should be appreciated that a disclosure that a function is specified in a file is very different from the Claim 26 (independent Claims 8, 12, 14, 27 and 28 recite similar limitations) requirement that a plurality of parameters for associating functional portions of an interface with a graphical image be defined in a file. In particular, the aforementioned limitations of Claim 26 delimit a relationship that the recited plurality of parameters have with the recited interface and the recited graphical image that is simply not taught or suggested by Ko et al. Consequently, the aforementioned limitations of Claim 26 (independent Claims 8, 12, 14, 27 and 28 recite similar limitations) are not met.

From the above discussion it is apparent that the Ko et al. reference does not satisfy the requirements of 35 USC 102 as Ko et al. does not teach or suggest key

limitations of Appellant's Claims. It should be appreciated that this deficiency of Ko et al. prevents Ko et al. from being properly employed as a reference upon which to base a 35 USC 102 rejection of independent Claims 8, 12, 14 and 26- 28.

Appellant respectfully submits that nowhere in the Ko et al. reference is a method of displaying a visible portion of a user interface for an application program that comprises defining a graphical image for a visible portion of a user interface in a first computer file and defining in a second computer file a plurality of parameters for associating a functional portion of the user interface with the graphical image taught or suggested as is set forth in independent Claim 26 (independent Claims 8, 12, 14, 27 and 28 recite similar limitations).

Because of the deficiencies of Ko et al. discussed above, Appellant respectfully submits that Ko et al. does not provide an adequate basis for the rejection of Claims 8, 12, 14 and 26-28 under 35 U.S.C. §102 and, as such, Claims 8, 12, 14 and 26-28 are allowable. Accordingly, the Appellant respectfully submits that Claims 4-7, 9, 24 and 25 dependent on Claim 26, Claim 11 dependent on Claim 27 and Claim 16 dependent on Claim 28, are likewise allowable as being dependent on allowable base claims.

Conclusion

For the reasons discussed above, Appellant believes that pending Claims 4-9, 11, 12, 14, 16 and 24-28 are patentable over Ko et al. Accordingly, Appellant respectfully requests that the rejection of these Claims be reversed.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Dated: 2/20, 2007

Glenn D. Barnes
Registration No. 42,293
Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

PATENT APPLICATION

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 200400110-1

IN THE
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Inventor(s): James FRISKEL

Application No.: 10/058,097

Filing Date: 01/29/2002

Confirmation No.: 1197

Examiner: HUYNH, B.

Group Art Unit: 2179

Title: SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR DEVELOPING AND PROCESSING A GRAPHICAL USER INTERFACE FOR A COMPUTER APPLICATION

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents
Commissioner For Patents
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TRANSMITTAL OF REPLY BRIEF

Transmitted herewith is the Reply Brief with respect to the Examiner's Answer mailed on 12/18/2006 .

This Reply Brief is being filed pursuant to 37 CFR 1.193(b) within two months of the date of the Examiner's Answer.

(Note: Extensions of time are not allowed under 37 CFR 1.136(a))

(Note: Failure to file a Reply Brief will result in dismissal of the Appeal as to the claims made subject to an expressly stated new ground rejection.)

No fee is required for filing of this Reply Brief.

If any fees are required please charge Deposit Account 08-2025.

☒ I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Date of Deposit: 02/20/2007

OR

☐ I hereby certify that this paper is being transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office facsimile number (571) 273-8300.

Date of facsimile:

Typed Name: Shannon Carmo

Signature:

Respectfully submitted,

James FRISKEL

By

Glenn D. Barnes

Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)

Reg No. : 42,293

Date : 02/20/2007

Telephone : (408) 938-9060